

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (LODG) NO. 432 OF 2006

Shri Mangilal Anraj Jain. ] .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The Slum Rehabilitation Authority ]  
and 4 ors. ] .. Respondents

Mr. H.S. Anand for the petitioner.

Mr. G.D. Uttangale for the respondent No.1.

Mr. Milind More, AGP, for the respondent No.2.

Mr. Anil R. Mishra for the respondent No.3.

Mrs. T. Puranik for the respondent No.5.

**CORAM: F.I. REBELLO &**  
**ANOOP V. MOHTA, JJ.**

**DATED: 09TH MARCH, 2006**

**P.C. :**

. Rule. Appearance put up on behalf of respondents No.1,2, 3 and 5. Notice of respondent No.4 waived as presently no adverse order is being passed against respondent No.4.

2. SRA Scheme has been sanctioned which is being carried on by respondent No.3. Petitioner claims that his name ought to have been included in Appendix II to

the Scheme. The petitioner's son has already availed the transit accommodation. Pending determination of his right, counsel for respondent No.3 informs that the claim of respondent No.4 has been rejected by the Appellate Authority. Considering the above, the limited controversy is whether petitioner is entitled to the benefit of the SRA Scheme. The Petition can be disposed of by issuing the following direction:

The Competent Officer of the respondent No.1, if the petitioner makes a representation within two weeks from today, to consider the said representation and dispose of the same according to law within 8 weeks thereafter.

3. Rule made absolute accordingly. No order as to costs.

Sd/-  
[F.I. REBELLO, J.]

Sd/-  
[ANOO V. MOHTA, J.]